DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 109 SO 034 442

AUTHOR	Stradling, Robert
TITLE	Informal Meeting of Project Coordinators in the Working Group on History and History Teaching in South East Europe (Strasbourg, France, August 31, 2001).
INSTITUTION	Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France).
PUB DATE	2001-08-31
NOTE	22p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Europe, F67075 Strasbourg, Cedex, France. Tel: 33-3-88-41-20-00; Web site: http://www.coe.int. For full text: http://www.coe.int/ T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/History_Teaching/ .
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; *Educational Cooperation; Foreign Countries; Geographic Regions; Higher Education; *History; *History Instruction; *Inservice Teacher Education; Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Europe (Southeast); Professional Meetings

ABSTRACT

At the December 2000 meeting of the working group, four priority areas of activity were identified: (1) curriculum development; (2) initial and inservice teacher training; (3) development of teaching resources; and (4) history teaching in higher education. The working group also anticipates that added value and synergy can be created through ongoing cooperation among the different quick-start projects as well as the dissemination of project outcomes. In August 2001, 11 quick-start projects (including at least one in each of the priority areas) had either been implemented or were planned for later in 2001. All but 2 of the projects (their duration varied from 12 months to 3 years) have secured funding. This report on the working group's informal meeting consists of the following sections: (1) "Summary of the Current Situation"; (2) "Up-Date on Developments at Task Force Level"; and (3) "Progress Report on the History Projects." Appendixes examine problems experienced in implementing the Quick Start History Projects and provide a list of participants. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 471 109

Strasbourg, France, 31 August 2001

Informal Meeting of Project Coordinators in the Working Group on History and History Teaching in South East Europe

Report by Dr. Robert STRADLING, Leirsinn Research Centre, University of the Highlands & Islands, Scotland

SO 034 442

Council of Europe
F67075 Strasbourg Cedex, France

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Borch-Jacobsen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Strasbourg, France, 31 August 2001

Informal Meeting of Project Coordinators in the Working Group on History and History Teaching in South East Europe

Report by Dr. Robert STRADLING

I. SUMMARY OF THE CURRENT SITUATION

II. UP-DATE ON DEVELOPMENTS AT TASK FORCE LEVEL

III. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE HISTORY PROJECTS

APPENDIX I - Problems experienced in implementing the Quick Start History Projects

APPENDIX II - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

I. SUMMARY OF THE CURRENT SITUATION .

At the second meeting of the Working Group in Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria (December 2000), four priority areas of activity were identified:

Curriculum development: beginning with stocktaking activities on current and proposed history curricula in the region, followed by dissemination of information and experience exchanges on the development and implementation of new curricula and curriculum development workshops.

Initial and in-service teacher training: to be targeted on potential multipliers (e.g. representatives for history teacher associations, history teachers already engaged in teacher training projects, inspectors, and teacher trainers). The main foci would be: a stocktaking exercise and workshops and seminars on the use of active and enquiry-based learning methods, teaching sensitive and controversial topics and themes, teaching regional history and teaching the history of everyday life.

The development of teaching resources: with an emphasis on (1) the development of handbooks for teachers and teacher training which focus on active learning, source-based approaches, multiperspectivity and comparative history; (2) school textbooks and other teaching materials which focus on regional history, particularly controversial and sensitive topics, periods and themes, and (3) the transposing of academic research into material suitable for use in schools with different age and ability ranges.

History teaching in higher education aimed at (1) establishing regional networks and initiatives, (2) regional exchange programmes for historians, teacher trainers and postgraduate students; and (3) improving the linkages between academic history, the training of history teachers, the writing of school textbooks and the teaching of history at school level.

Whilst recognising that the establishment of a limited number of goals and priority areas heightens the risk of excessive duplication (of effort, of aims and objectives and also of participating institutions and individuals) the Working Group also anticipates that added value and synergy can be created through

ongoing co-operation between the different quick-start projects as well as the dissemination of project outcomes.

By the time of the meeting in Strasbourg in August 2001, 11 quick start projects (including at least one in each of these priority areas) had either been implemented or were planned to start later in 2001. All but two had secured funding by that time. The duration of projects varied from 12 months to 3 years (although one project which has not yet secured funding has a planned duration of 5 years). However, the majority, consistent with the aims of the Quick Start Package, were planned to be completed by the end of December 2001. An up-date on these projects is provided later in this report.

II. UP-DATE ON DEVELOPMENTS AT TASK FORCE LEVEL

Alison CARDWELL reported that a meeting of Working Group Co-ordinators and staff from the Stability Pact Office had been held in Brussels in July 2001. Some degree of re-structuring and streamlining had been taking place within the Stability Pact and this had included a review of ongoing activities and priorities for future development. It was felt that the procedures for monitoring of progress and evaluation of outcomes needed to be tightened up, all of the Task Forces and Working Groups within Task Forces needed to be working to the same procedures, and more needed to be done to ensure effective linkages and synergy within and between Working Groups and across the different Task Forces. At the same time, the Working Group coordinators had emphasised the need for greater consistency at the level of the SPO and the Task Force Offices in policy and practice, guidance to Working Groups and individual projects and the need for greater clarification as well as consistency in the language used in the documentation (e.g. the terms projects, initiatives and activities often seem to be used interchangeably; the distinctions between donor and beneficiary countries can be blurred when both groups may be located within the SEE and are also described as partner countries).

Heidrun SCHULZE, on behalf of the Task Force, also provided an up-date on recent developments. She explained that the first half of the year had been dominated by a number of issues and initiatives. These had included:

- lobbying for the inclusion of Education in CARDS, the new European Union programme for the Western Balkans;

- discussions on Stability 2001 - a proposed new strategic, flexible framework and work plan for the Stability Pact;

- discussions of the OECD's Thematic Reviews and their implications for the implementation of the new strategic framework. These reviews had taken the form of stocktaking audits and needs analyses of the educational systems in the various SEE countries. They had focused on provision, financing, governance, infrastructure, equity of access, issues relating to quality and standards in curriculum content, teacher training, teaching and learning, and the open-ness of the education system (including adaptability to social and economic changes, life-long learning, early years provision, etc.) Draft reports were now available on most of the countries and the final reports were expected in the second half of 2001. Discussions within the Task Force had focused on how the Thematic Reviews could be widely disseminated to raise awareness amongst national stakeholders and the international community, how they could help in the development of national action plans, and how they might have a role to play in individual countries' EU accession strategies.

Ms SCHULZE also explained that, following a meeting of Working Table 1 in May 2001, a new plan of action had emerged with four main priorities:

The media: focusing on improved communications, freedom of expression and the implementation of the Stability Pact's Charter for Media Freedom.

Refugees: with an emphasis on developing a multilateral framework for addressing issues relating to the return or local integration of refugees;

Inter-ethnic relations: focusing on the promotion of human rights, including the rights of minorities; the fostering of trans-frontier co-operation, and the rehabilitation of multiethnic and multicultural societies in the region.

Education and Youth: with a dual focus on assistance with developing and implementing national priorities for education and youth and enhanced regional co-operation.

The establishing of four priority areas represented the streamlining and rationalising of the activities of WT1 to ensure greater impact and effectiveness but it did not entail the cessation of any of the existing Task Forces. Ms Schulze reiterated that the History Working Group's four priority areas for development were now incorporated into the revised plan for Education and Youth.

This up-date was then followed by general discussion of two issues. First, some of the planned activities for the second half of 2001 and for 2002-3 involved the participation of countries such as Turkey, Greece, Cyprus, Slovenia and Hungary, which did not qualify as beneficiaries within the framework of the Stability Pact but could be donor countries and were also perceived as partner countries within some of the projects and initiatives. However, to exclude such countries from regional seminars and bilateral and multilateral projects and initiatives raised particular problems within the context of history and history education since their own histories have often been inextricably linked to those of the other countries in the region.

Second, there was also some discussion about the need to find ways of ensuring effective networking between the History Working Group (as an entity), the key donors and the representatives of national Ministries of Education. This was critical if the outcomes of the funded projects were to have a longer-term impact on policy and practice within the region.

III. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE HISTORY PROJECTS

Southeast European Joint History Project (Phase 1)

Implementing Agency	Center for Democracy & Reconciliation in SEE
Donors	Funding pre-dates Stability Pact
Pledge in Euros	NA

Professor Christina KOULOURI reported that seven regional workshops on history textbook analysis had now been held. These had covered: the Hungarian legacy, teaching about Cyprus, the Macedonian Identity, Albania and its neighbours, the

Ottoman Empire, the Former Yugoslavia and Religious Education in the Balkans. A report comprising seven volumes of papers is now being prepared and should be available by January 2002.

Southeast European Joint History Project (Phase 2)

Implementing Agency	Center for Democracy & Reconciliation in SEE
Donors	Austria, Switzerland
Pledge in Euros	75,000 Euro [46,000 Euro still required as of 31.12.2000]

In this phase, which has been held under the aegis of the Stability Pact, seven Teacher Training Workshops have been planned on: the Balkan Wars, the First World War and the Creation of Yugoslavia, the Second World War, the creation of the Albanian State, the Ottoman Empire and the creation of Nation States, Cyprus, and the Balkan Wars. These workshops were aimed at both primary and secondary school teachers and had a very practical focus.

At the time of the meeting in Strasbourg, five of the workshops had been held. The remaining two (on Cyprus and the Balkan Wars) were to be held in October and December 2001 respectively. The Center would now like to develop and publish teaching material around the themes covered by the Teacher Training Workshops. These materials would be evaluated at four regional workshops. The Center would also like to produce between two and four short videos on the work of the JHP which would be aimed at an audience engaged in teacher training.

Christina KOULOURI also referred the meeting to a short paper submitted by Halil BERKTAY for the development of a module and resource book on The Balkan Wars 1912-1913. This would include timelines, maps, socio-economic information on the newly-emerged Balkan nation states, primary source material relating to key questions and issues, a selection of secondary source material reflecting the historiography of this topic. Since Halil Bertay was unable to attend the meeting, discussion of this proposal was delayed until the next meeting in December, 2001.

Board of Eminent Scholars

Implementing Agency	Center for Democracy & Reconciliation in SEE
Donors	US State Department
Pledge in Euros	103,000 Euro

The Board, a group of academics who specialise in the history of Southeast Europe, organises workshops and conferences within the region primarily for young postgraduate historians. So far three such workshops have been organised on:

- The Enlightenment and its heritage,

- Constitutionalism and Parliamentarianism,

- Traditions of Liberty in Southeast Europe.

The first two have already been held and the third was planned for September 2001 to be held in Thessaloniki, Greece.

The US State Department has indicated that it is interested in continuing to fund the junior workshops on an annual basis. Professor KOULOURI noted that the workshops are making a significant contribution to the production of new, research-based knowledge. However, at present, almost all of the students who attended these workshops were from the region but studying in the US or Western Europe. This reflected a broader trend in the region, which could be described as a `brain drain', and it will take time to reverse this pattern. However, important developments in postgraduate history studies were taking place in Bulgaria and Romania and these might provide a model for the rest of the region.

The Board of Eminent Scholars has also planned a conference on memory and history to be held in the spring of 2002. There will be a follow-up publication to be edited by Professor Maria Todorova.

The Center would also like to produce two short videos to disseminate more widely the work of the Board of Eminent Scholars.

Comparative Study: Structures and Standards in the Initial Training of history teachers in SE Europe

Implementing Agencies	Council of Europe and Institute for Economic & Social History, University of Vienna
Donors	Austria
Pledge in Euros	40,000 Euros

Alison CARDWELL reported that the first phase of this project involved a survey of current provision and practice. She told the participants about the draft questionnaire which had then been discussed and refined at a workshop held during the Council of Europe's Teacher Training Conference in Athens, September 2000. The final version had then been distributed to experts in each SEE country. Experts included: researchers, higher education staff engaged in initial teacher training and ministry officials.

The preliminary results from the survey were then discussed at a meeting of experts in Veliko Tarnavo, Bulgaria on 18-19 May, 2001. This proved a useful means of clarifying some of the information already provided, adding new information, identifying the most urgent problems for initial teacher training in the region and planning the next stage in the project.

A report on this meeting was produced by Mark McLAUGHLIN and is now available from the Council of Europe ["The preparation of a comparative study on the initial training of history teachers in South East Europe", Strasbourg DGIV/EDU/HIST (2001) 04].

The next meeting of experts was planned for September 2001 in Podgorica where the final results were to be presented and the next stage of the project was to be finalised. It was anticipated that the final draft of the report on the comparative study was likely to be completed by the end of October 2001.

Understanding a Shared Past, Learning for the Future

Implementing Agency	EUROCLIO
Donors	The Netherlands
Pledge in Euros	724,000 Euros [2000-2003]

Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD reported that the aim of this project was to work with the History Teachers' Associations in Albania, Bulgaria and "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" to develop joint teaching materials suitable for a teachers' Handbook. Workshops and planning meetings had already taken place in "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (February 2001), Albania (April 2001) and Bulgaria (June 2001). The next meeting was planned for September.

Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD distributed a short planning document for the project which demonstrated that the mode of working combined regional, national and local workshops and planning meetings with funded opportunities for members of the national project groups to attend conferences, participate in textbook analysis seminars run by the Georg Eckert Institute, etc.

She felt that the team now had a clear idea of what the Handbook was going to look like and the outline and plan of work should be finalised by April 2002. It was anticipated that a series of in-service training seminars using the handbook would be held in all three participating countries between February and May 2003 with an end-of-project seminar being held in June or August 2003. The organisers are also planning to hold an exhibition at the same time because it is anticipated that the project will generate so much useful and fascinating material that it cannot all be used in the Handbook.

She also noted that some interest had been expressed in Albania about the possibility of a parallel project on curriculum development but this would require additional financial support. Discussions were ongoing. She also reported that she had had a request from Bosnia and Herzegovina to incorporate them into the project but she needed to identify a potential network there before taking this request any further. Alison CARDWELL reported that France intended supporting a workshop in Sarajevo

and that this might provide the opportunity to identify or generate such a network. EUROCLIO had also had an approach from Romania for a similar sort of project (outside the aegis of the Stability Pact). The Foreign Ministry of the Netherlands was also interested in supporting a similar activity in Serbia.

National and Regional History Teacher Training Seminars

Implementing Agency	Council of Europe in partnership with EUROCLIO
Donors	Austria, Switzerland with some local funding for specific seminars and workshops in partner countries
Pledge in Euros	107,500 Euros

Financial support has now been secured for a series of teacher training seminars, some of which will be national and some regional. At the time of the Strasbourg meeting three seminars had been held. The first was in Tirana, Albania (23-24 February, 2001), the second in Belgrade, Serbia (5-7 March) and the third in Ohrid, "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (7-8 May). Alison CARDWELL reported that a further four were being planned for the second half of 2001: a regional seminar in Bled, Slovenia supported by the Slovenian Ministry of Education; a regional seminar in Budapest supported by the Hungarian Ministry of Education, a national seminar in Romania and a national seminar in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The emphasis in the planning of these workshops and seminars has been on methodology rather than content but clearly a balance has to be struck between the two since methodology needs to be applied within a context and cannot be discussed in a total vacuum devoid of content. The context is usually modern history, particularly the 20th Century with a particular emphasis on controversial and sensitive topics and themes within regional and national history.

Textbook Development and Comparison in History in SEE

Implementing Agency	Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research
Donors	Germany
Pledge in Euros	243,000 Euros

Heike KARGE reported on developments since the last meeting of the Working Group in December 2000. The project has three main aims which are to:

- develop a trans-national communication network for textbook authors, scholars and education stakeholders in SEE;

- explore possibilities for presenting history using different kinds of media;

- facilitate cross-border textbook research.

In the first part of 2001, much of the project activity had focused on technical issues associated with creating the Virtual Textbook Centre in partnership with the University of Zagreb. The objective here is to provide useful, practical information for teachers and researchers. The initial development work is complete and the web-site is up and running at www.see-textbook.net From now on, the addition of new information and material on curricula, textbook analysis, etc. can be undertaken by the co-ordinators from local sites. There are currently two coordinators in Zagreb and one in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Money is now available for coordinators for Serbia and Montenegro, but there have been difficulties in finding suitable coordinators for Kosovo and "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia".

Heike KARGE also noted that coordinators had experienced some difficulties in obtaining information from State institutions. It was hoped that this problem will disappear as the network becomes better known.

Also the Institute jointly (with UNESCO) organised a seminar in Sarajevo in April 2001 on "Curriculum- and Textbook-development for history teaching in Bosnia and Herzegovina". The target group included ministry officials, teacher educators,

textbook authors, history teachers, historians and international experts. The project team were now working on a series of recommendations for textbook development aimed specifically at Ministry officials. It was hoped to finalise these by December 2001.

In July 2001, the Institute published a journal on "Minorities in Textbooks in South eastern Europe" which includes articles on Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Croatia and other SEE countries.

Planning was now underway for a summer school in Braunschweig on 24-30 September 2001 on the topic "The Balkans in Europe". The target group will be around 20 history teachers and potential textbook authors from Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Romania and Serbia. The main aims will be to appraise the balance between national, regional and European history in textbooks; examine crucial topics for interpreting the interrelations of the Balkans and the rest of Europe, and look at how to present controversial issues of Balkan and European history in textbooks.

Finally, Ms KARGE reported that, just two weeks before the Strasbourg meeting, the project had secured additional funding for enlargement to include Serbia and Montenegro within the network and other project activities.

Creating Additional Materials for Teaching SEE History

Implementing Agency	CSBSC - Centre for the Study of the Balkan Society, University of Graz, Austria
Donors	Austria, OSCE, CSBSC
Pledge in Euros	161,370 Euros

The objective here was to develop teaching materials for secondary school teachers, and resource materials for university lecturers and their students on common cultural and historical characteristics of the countries of the SEE region. Topics and themes include the history of childhood, gender, migration, old age and work.

Daniela GRABE reported that the first volume, on Childhood, was published in English in April 2001 and is now being translated into the SEE languages. It had already been used as the basis of two teacher training workshops in Serbia and Croatia. The manuscript for the second volume, on Gender, is ready but they had experienced some difficulties in finding and retaining experts within the region and in getting them to understand what was required. They had experienced some translation problems as well.

The two multilateral workshops had proved to be very successful and the representatives of the Ministries of Education had been interested in what was emerging from the project. This represented a marked change of position. Initially, there had been some official opposition to the project's aims and objectives, partly because of a reluctance to change the practice of history education and partly because of the regional rather than national perspective.

Daniela Grabe also presented a short paper outlining a new three-year proposal from the CSBSC which would seek to build on the work carried out in the Quick Start project. This would continue the three project lines established in August 2000: an academic publishing programme, the Teaching Materials programme and the Project development programme, but also add two additional project lines:

Secondary school teacher training seminars, with a specific emphasis on social history and methodologies drawing on the teaching materials produced in phases 1 and 2;

University Teacher Training in Social History and Historical Anthropology based on the academic readers produced during phases 1 and 2.

It is proposed to hold at least four teacher training seminars and three university teacher workshops per year.

Proposals for Projects in the period following the Quick Start Package

In addition to the new proposals already mentioned in this report a number of other outline proposals were tabled for

information that will need to be appraised by the full Working Group on History at its next meeting. These proposals included:

Textbooks and curricula of History, Geography, Literature and Civics in the Former Republics of Yugoslavia prepared by the Forum Za Slobodu Odgoja (FSO) - an NGO based in Zagreb

A curriculum development project for history Teaching in Serbia prepared by the institute for Educational Research, Belgrade

Teaching and Learning practices to develop values and attitudes within the Romanian National Curriculum prepared by the Institute for Educational Sciences, Bucharest.

Developing model curricula with a focus on "Southeastern Europe as a part of European history, prepared by the Georg Eckert Institute.

The Everyday life of ordinary people in the Ottoman Empire 1500-1800 which would start as an archive-based research project which would produce materials suitable for conversion into teaching materials by pedagogic specialists. Prepared by the Institute for History of Montenegro and Ministry of Education, Montenegro.

Regional teacher training workshops on teaching about the conflicts in the former republics of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, prepared by the Ministry of Education, Montenegro.

Issues for discussion at the next meeting of the Working Group, December 2001

A number of issues emerged during the meeting but time was limited and these had to be postponed until the full meeting of the working group. At the end of the meeting, it was felt that it might be useful to send project co-ordinators a short pro-forma asking them about the problems they have experienced in implementing their projects. Representatives from most of the projects covered in this report responded and their views are summarised in the Appendix. Thanks are due to all those who found the time to respond. In addition to the problems outlined in the Appendix, the following issues and concerns kept emerging during our discussions:

There needs to be a better system for exchanging information about the themes being covered in workshops, the participants who are being invited, the degree of involvement of Ministries of Education and state institutions, etc. Otherwise, there is a serious risk of duplication of effort and the development of a relatively small vanguard of innovators who are involved in several projects but are not effectively disseminating the knowledge and skills they are developing. It is in the interests of all of the projects that the Working Group takes the initiative and establishes a shared list of participants.

In addition to finding out if we are all working with the same, relatively small group of `multipliers', we also need to find out if they are in fact cascading their experience to their colleagues. More may need to be done to contact participants after workshops, seminars and conferences. It is good practice to evaluate seminars and workshops in terms of whether or not they met the participants' needs and expectations but we also need to find out more about their longer-term impact.

However, whilst it is critically important to avoid too much duplication, it is also important to encourage cross-fertilisation between projects. There was some evidence of cooperation and cross-fertilisation between some project teams but, as one respondent to the pro forma pointed out, the limited pool of donors ensures that projects are often in competition with each other for the same funding within the same priority areas and this tends to encourage competition rather than cooperation.

Finally, a number of project coordinators have identified a language problem that is having a negative impact on some activities. Some participants are not really very fluent in the working language(s) of the workshops and seminars are conducted. The provision of simultaneous translation within the context of multilateral seminars is usually too expensive and consecutive translation is usually done by participants who may be reasonably fluent but are not trained or experienced in translation. This is particularly problematic when there are workshop activities which require the active participation of each person in the group.

Any Other Business

The next meeting of the History Working Group will be held in Sarajevo on 16-17 December following on from a Council of Europe history seminar.

Gottfried WAGNER is leaving KulturKontakt to take up the post of Secretary General of the European Cultural Foundation.

Daniela Grabe's new address will be:
Ulica Bryast 10/II
Sofia - Quartal Losenec
BULGARIA
Tel: 003 59 2 669533
email@ danielagrabe@kfunigraz.at
danielagrabe@gmx.at

APPENDIX I . Problems experienced in implementing the Quick Start History Projects .

Financial problems
Most of the coordinators experienced a significant delay in getting the money pledged by donors. In some cases, there was an administrative delay between agreeing to the project and formally authorising it. In one instance, this took eight months and led to the start of the project being postponed several times. However, one coordinator also reported that the project had been completed before receiving the committed funding from the donor.

One coordinator also found that the donor's estimates of the costs of the proposed project were lower than those produced by the project team (who had a better grasp of the real costs involved). As a result, the project was under-funded.

Most project coordinators also found it very difficult to operate in an inflationary economic context where the budgets for travel, translation, publication and distribution which were realistic in 2000 were inadequate in 2001-2. This problem was made worse where donors took a long time to authorise funding for projects.

Other implementation problems
Some coordinators also observed that it always took more time to do things than had originally been planned, particularly on multilateral projects. This could be due to local political situations, to the inexperience of some local project team members and also to the private problems of key individuals within project teams. There were also logistical problems due to some individuals not having access to fax machines, e-mail, etc. difficulties of travelling to some places in mid-winter, problems experienced by some individuals when trying to get visas to travel. Also, some coordinators experienced problems with identifying appropriate contacts within Ministries and then getting official support for local participation in projects. Is there a role here for the Task Force?

Were Stability Pact procedures easy to follow?
The short answer from virtually all of the respondents could be summarised as: What are these procedures? It was felt that, at

the beginning in 2000, these were not at all clear and some respondents felt that they were still not clear. When standardised forms, etc. emerged it would have been helpful if clear guidelines had been available to help less experienced project teams fill them in correctly. But even then the experienced organisations had a major advantage in terms of already having established links with donors and able to access networks in order to implement their projects.

Some project coordinators also experienced major problems and concerns once some of the STP's rules and requirements became clearer. In the words of one respondent, the exclusion of Turkey, Greece, Cyprus, Slovenia, Hungary "is ridiculous if you want to look at Balkan history and culture!" It was felt unfair that project teams were not allowed to spend money on the travel costs, translation costs, etc. of participants from the non-target countries.

Do the STP requirements for accountability and reporting present any difficulties?
This question was intended to focus on an issue which had been discussed at the previous full Working Group meeting in December 2000: the evaluation of Quick-start projects. There had been some concern at that meeting that project coordinators already had to submit auditors' reports and undertake evaluations to meet the requirements of their donors and were worried about the additional work that might be involved if the Task Force were to impose an additional layer of evaluation and reporting. Generally, the respondents indicated that they were not at all clear what the STP requirements for accountability and reporting were. Those who had negotiated their own funding with donors had to meet very demanding accountability requirements which were time consuming but they had an incentive to meet these requirements since this released funding and offered the possibility of future initiatives as well. To add a second layer of accountability using a standardised procedure that took no account of the donors' requirements and procedures was not regarded as an attractive option by the respondents.

Will you be able to complete the project on time?
Responses on this question were mixed. Only one was sure that they would finish on time. Two others hoped so but thought that it probably depended on factors outside their control. One

respondent reported that they had already had to postpone one project deadline because of factors outside their control.

Have you been able to cooperate with other projects within the STP's Working Group on history?
All respondents said that there had been some cross-project cooperation but the potential here was not yet being fully realised.

Would it be a good idea to hold an extended meeting of the working Group that included current and potential donors as well?
Whilst respondents saw some benefits in this, there were also reservations. In particular, it was felt that the presence of the donors at the whole meeting would be inhibiting, especially if coordinators needed to talk about problems, including problems with donors. There was support for a limited extension, possibly a meeting with donors before the actual meeting of the Working Group took place.

APPENDIX II . LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .

Those present:

Ms. Alison CARDWELL (Chair of the Working Group)
Ms. Daniela GRABE
Ms Heike KARGE
Prof. Christina KOULOURI
Ms Heidrun SCHULZE
Dr. Robert STRADLING
Ms Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD

Apologies from:

Dr Halil BERKTAY,
Ms Gabriele BUCHER-DINC
Prof. Alois ECKER
Dr. Falk PINGEL
Mr Jens REUTER

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").